

This section describes the existing population, employment, and housing in both Placer County and Squaw Valley. The purpose of this section is to identify, estimate, and evaluate population, employment, and housing changes that would occur as a result of project implementation and that could have the potential to cause physical environmental effects. Physical environmental effects associated with project implementation are addressed in the technical sections of the Draft EIR.

### 4.10.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### POPULATION

##### Placer County

The project site is located in northeastern Placer County, which encompasses six incorporated communities: Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. The county's population was estimated to be 369,454 as of January 1, 2015. Approximately 69 percent (256,906) of the county's population resides in incorporated cities and towns and the remaining 31 percent (112,548) resides in the unincorporated county (DOF 2015a). The county's 2030 population is projected to be 447,625 (DOF 2014), an increase of over 21 percent from 2015.

The project site is located approximately 18 miles west of the border between California and the state of Nevada. Nevada County is located north of Placer County; its largest metropolitan area, the town of Truckee, is located approximately 11 miles north of the project site. The general project region is sparsely populated, and the largest metropolitan areas consist of Reno and Sparks, located approximately 40 miles northeast of the project site in Washoe County, Nevada. **Table 4.10-1** shows growth projections for Placer County and the surrounding counties of Nevada and Washoe.

**TABLE 4.10-1**  
**CURRENT AND PROJECTED POPULATIONS OF PLACER, NEVADA, AND WASHOE COUNTIES**

	2015	2020	2025	2030
Placer County	373,503	396,203	421,002	447,625
Nevada County	98,633	101,767	105,389	108,111
Washoe County	483,803	528,654	573,332	620,323

Source: DOF 2014; Washoe County 2010

##### Squaw Valley

For the purposes of this EIR, the local setting is based on US Census Bureau demographic information provided for the Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) 96146. This ZCTA includes the Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows areas. Zip Code Tabulation Areas are approximate area representations of US Postal Service five-digit zip code service areas that the US Census Bureau creates using whole blocks of present statistical data from censuses and surveys. The 96146 ZCTA had a population of approximately 1,366 in 2010. This data indicates an increase of approximately 440 people from 2000 to 2010 (US Census Bureau 2010). In Squaw Valley, the current full-time residential population is 879.

## 4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

---

Squaw Valley has a mixture of single-family and multi-family homes, vacation homes, condominiums, timeshares, and resort-oriented temporary lodging, including hotels and condo hotels. As a result, the full-time resident population of Squaw Valley is only a portion of the overall daytime and overnight population. Visitors are not accounted for in the census. Therefore, the functional population of the valley may be greater than indicated by census data, depending on the season and tourism rates.

Placer County estimates that the current maximum overnight peak population of Squaw Valley is approximately 5,858 residents and guests, including existing single- and multi-family residences, as well as existing condo, timeshare, and hotel lodging units. The peak population of existing single- and multi-family residences is estimated to be 2,281, based on the number of units reported in the 2010 US Census, plus construction permits issued between June 2010 and February 5, 2014 (1,037 total units), and assuming 2.20 persons per household. This is a conservative estimate of existing peak overnight population that assumes all available units are 100 percent occupied. Actual overnight peak occupancies are unknown (Placer County 2015, p. 5-2).

### HOUSING

#### Placer County

As of 2010, a total of 152,648 housing units were available in Placer County, approximately 13 percent of which were vacant. These housing units consist of approximately 80 percent single-family homes, 3 percent mobile homes, and 17 percent multi-family units. As of 2013, there were an estimated 155,873 housing units in Placer County, an increase of 3,225 since 2010 (Placer County 2015, p. 5-5).

#### Squaw Valley

Placer County estimates that there are 1,037 single- and multi-family units and approximately 1,364 leasable guest rooms and hotel rooms available in Squaw Valley. Housing units increased at a rate of 3.88 percent between 2000 and 2010 in ZCTA 96146 (see **Table 4.10-2**). This is a higher rate of growth than experienced in the unincorporated county area overall (1.30 percent) during that same period, but less than the growth rate of the incorporated county areas (5.10 percent). The growth rate of households, or occupied housing units, followed a similar trend with an average annual growth rate of 3.80 percent. Although this rate was more than experienced in the unincorporated areas of the county (1.9 percent), it was less than reported for cities in Placer County (5.4 percent).

The addition of housing units in the Squaw Valley area between 2000 and 2010 is associated with an increase in the number of households. This may be attributable to both an increase in population and a relatively small household size. Household size in 2010 was smaller in Squaw Valley (2.20) than in the unincorporated county area overall (2.57) and for the state (2.90). The portion of housing units that are intended as vacation properties remained approximately 60 percent (Placer County 2015, p. 5-5).

**TABLE 4.10-2**  
**HOUSEHOLDS, HOUSING SIZE, AND HOUSING UNITS IN ZCTA 96146: 2000, 2010, AND 2013**

	2000	2010	2013 (estimate)
<i>Households<sup>1</sup></i>			
Number	405	588	—
Growth from Previous Period	—	183	—
% AAGR from Previous Period	—	3.80%	—
Average Household Size	2.29	2.20	—
<i>Housing Units<sup>2</sup></i>			
Number	1,179	1,726	1,819
Growth from Previous Period	—	547	93
% AAGR from Previous Period	—	3.88%	1.76%
<i>Housing Intended for Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use</i>			
Number	754	1,057	—
Growth from Previous Period	—	303	—
% AAGR from Previous Period	—	3.44%	—

Source: Placer County 2015, p. 5-6; US Census Bureau 2010

Notes:

AAGR = average annual growth rate

1. A "household" is a person or group of people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.

2. A "housing unit" is a single-family house, townhouse, mobile home or trailer, apartment, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied as a separate living quarters or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy as separate living quarters.

## 4.10.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

### Placer County General Plan

Following is a list of General Plan policies that relate to either population growth or the proposed project.

#### Land Use Element

**Policy 1.M.1.** The County shall concentrate most new growth within existing communities emphasizing infill development, intensified use of existing development, and expanded services, so individual communities become more complete, diverse, and balanced.

**Policy 1.M.2.** The County shall encourage large residential projects to be phased or timed to occur simultaneously with development that will provide primary wage-earner jobs.

#### Housing Element

**Policy A-6.** The County shall encourage residential development of high architectural and physical quality.

## 4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

---

**Policy A-7.** Placer County shall continue to implement the policies and requirements of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual, Landscape Design Guidelines, and community design elements of the various community plans.

**Policy C-2.** The County shall require new development in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to mitigate potential impacts to employee housing by housing 50 percent of the fulltime equivalent employees (FTEE) generated by the development. If the project is an expansion of an existing use, the requirement shall only apply to that portion of the project that is expanded (e.g., the physical footprint of the project or an intensification of the use). Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways:

- Construction of on-site employee housing;
- Construction of off-site employee housing;
- Dedication of land for needed units; and/or
- Payment of an in-lieu fee.

### **Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance**

The Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance does not contain any policies applicable to population, housing, or employment and the proposed project.

### **4.10.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The impact analysis provided below is based on the application of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Appendix G environmental checklist. A project is considered to have a significant effect on the environment if it will:

- 1) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- 2) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- 3) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT DISCUSSED FURTHER

The project site is currently vacant, containing no existing housing units or residents. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any housing or people and standards of significance 2 and 3 are not evaluated further in this EIR.

### METHODOLOGY

The following impact analysis was based on review of relevant planning documents, including the Placer County General Plan and the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance as well as current demographic data for Placer County and the 96146 ZCTA, in which the project site is located.

### PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Induce Substantial Population Growth (Standard of Significance 1)

**Impact 4.10.1** The proposed development would provide housing for up to 176 new residents in Squaw Valley. Such an increase in population would not be considered substantial and would not exceed growth projections for the region. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

As described previously, the project proposes the development of 63 attached and detached single-family residential units on the project site. Conservatively assuming 17 secondary units, the project would have the potential to develop a total of up to 80 residential units. This would represent a 3.3 percent increase in Squaw Valley's existing housing stock (1,819 units) and a 0.14 percent increase in the housing stock of the unincorporated portion of the county (55,891). The project site is designated by the Placer County General Plan for residential development at the proposed density. Therefore, the addition of the proposed residential units would not be considered a substantial increase.

The proposed project's 63 residential units would result in an increase of approximately 139 people, based on a persons-per-household factor of 2.20 ( $63 \times 2.20 = 138.6$ ). Assuming the same persons-per-household factor for the 17 secondary units, the total on-site population would be 176 ( $80 \times 2.20 = 176$ ). It is likely that a portion of the housing units on-site would be second or vacation homes and would not have permanent residents. However, conservatively assuming all 176 residents are permanent, this would represent a 12.9 percent increase in the population of the subject ZCTA and a 0.16 percent increase in population in the county's unincorporated area. These percentages are not considered substantial increases in the overall population of the region and would not exceed projected growth in the county.

Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the region beyond what is anticipated in the Placer County General Plan and the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance. This impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Employee Housing

**Impact 4.10.2** As a residential use, the proposed project would not directly generate any employment. However, the proposed project may result in indirect employment growth, requiring the construction of additional employee housing. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Policy C-2 of the Housing Element requires that new development in the Sierra Nevada provide housing for a minimum of 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees (FTEE) generated by

## 4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

---

a development. Using FTEE generation rates used for single-family residential projects in Martis Valley, the proposed project would generate two FTEEs.<sup>1</sup> The project does not specifically propose any employee housing to meet its needs under Policy C-2.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.10.2**      **Provision of Employee Housing.** The project applicant shall mitigate potential impacts to employee housing through compliance with the Placer County General Plan Housing Element policy (C-2) requiring new Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe projects to house 50 percent of the employee housing demand (e.g., FTEE employees) generated by the project. Compliance shall be demonstrated prior to approval of improvement plans for each project component. The project applicant shall submit to Placer County an Employee Housing Mitigation Plan detailing the method of providing the required employee housing units, proposed occupancy (rental or for sale), number of employees served by the employee housing units, or in the case of in-lieu fee payment, number of employees credited, transportation to and from the project, timing of the development of employee housing units, and any incentives requested.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2** would reduce the affordable housing and employee-housing imbalance impacts of the proposed project to **less than significant**. The above mitigation measure would bring the proposed project into compliance with policies pertaining to housing in the Placer County General Plan Housing Element. Since the specific method of providing employee housing has yet to be determined, it is not possible to determine, through a site-specific analysis, the exact extent of the environmental effects of the provision of the employee housing. However, the following discussion describes the general environmental impacts, to the extent possible, for each of the methods of satisfying the employee housing requirement.

The implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2** would have four potential outcomes per Placer County Housing Element Policy C-2:

- Construction of on-site employee housing.
- Construction of off-site employee housing.
- Dedication of land for needed units; and/or.
- Payment of an in-lieu fee.

Each of these options could result in construction of employee housing and the environmental effect of fulfilling the mitigation measure. Each option is discussed below.

### Provision of On-Site Employee Housing

---

<sup>1</sup> 0.00001 FTEE/2,860 square feet of single family residential use – Placer County Siller Ranch Draft EIR Table 4.2-10.

The project does not propose on-site employee housing. However, the proposed project could participate in the development of employee housing on-site through the development of restricted second units on the site. This Draft EIR evaluates the physical environmental impacts of the potential to develop up to 17 second units on the site (in addition to the 63 attached and detached single-family residential units).

#### Provision of Off-Site Employee Housing

Several options exist for providing off-site employee housing. The project applicant could assist in funding or partner with a planned multi-family housing proposal in the county which includes affordable housing in order to provide employee housing suitable to meet the needs of the project. The project applicant is not precluded from developing employee housing units off-site through any of these methods or from developing an employee housing project not currently proposed (e.g., land area planned for high-density residential development) that could meet the project's employee housing need. Potential environmental impacts associated with development of off-site employee housing are summarized below.

- Loss of habitat for common and special-status species
- Loss of cultural resources
- Water quality effects related to the development of impervious and other urban surfaces, soil erosion, and changes to surface water patterns, drainage, and runoff
- Increased trip generation, resulting in increased use of existing roads and intersections
- Incremental increase in need for public services and utilities
- Changes to public and private views of the project site
- Temporary water quality, noise, air quality, and traffic impacts from project construction

Provision of off-site employee housing could also take the form of substantial rehabilitation of existing housing units in the Martis Valley/North Lake Tahoe region of Placer County. This would likely result in reduced environmental impacts because the site would already be disturbed, reducing the likelihood of impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, and surface waters. However, this method of providing employee housing could result in increased trip generation and resultant noise impacts and air emissions as well as increased need for services and utilities, particularly if the rehabilitated units allowed an increase in density over the existing use. This method would also result in temporary water quality, noise, air quality, and traffic impacts from project construction.

#### Dedication of Land for Employee Housing

The project applicant could provide land to the County in order to meet the requirements of mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2**. A variety of sites in the County are appropriate for multi-family housing development that could meet the needs of the proposed project. These sites are located in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

While the act of dedicating land to the County would not result in an environmental impact, the future development of employee housing on the site would result in potential environmental impacts, including temporary surface water quality, air quality, and noise impacts associated

## 4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

---

with construction; operational noise and air quality impacts; increased vehicle trips and congestion on area roadways; biological resource impacts associated with construction and operation; and cultural resource and aesthetic impacts associated with construction. Additionally, an employee housing project would generate increased need for services, including water, wastewater, fire, law enforcement, schools, and recreation facilities.

### Payment of an In-Lieu Fee

The final option associated with mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2** is payment of an in-lieu fee. While payment of the fee to the County would not result in an environmental impact, revenue from the fee program could be used to fund the future construction of employee housing which would result in potential environmental impacts, including temporary surface water quality, air quality, and noise impacts associated with construction; operational noise and air quality impacts; increased vehicle trips and congestion on area roadways; biological resource impacts associated with construction and operation; and cultural resource and aesthetic impacts associated with construction. Additionally, an employee housing project would generate increased need for services, including water, wastewater, fire, law enforcement, schools, and recreation facilities.

### 4.10.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for population and housing includes eastern Placer County.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Cumulative Growth Inducement

**Impact 4.10.3** The proposed project, when considered with other existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in Squaw Valley, would contribute to regional population and employment growth. The proposed project's contribution to cumulative growth inducement would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

The cumulative setting for population, housing, and employment impacts includes existing land use conditions, future growth described in the various land use plans that apply to the project area, and proposed and approved projects.

As described in Impact 4.10.1, the proposed project would provide housing for up to 176 new residents in the valley. This is not considered a substantial increase in the overall population of the region and would not exceed projected growth in the county. Additionally, the project does not include any nonresidential uses and would result in minimal indirect employment growth. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to population growth in the region would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.



### REFERENCES

- DOF (California Department of Finance). 2014. *Report P-1 (Total Population): State and County Population Projections, 2010-2060*.
- . 2015a. *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change – January 1, 2014 and 2015*.
- . 2015b. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State – January 1, 2011–2015*.
- Placer County. 1983. *Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance*.
- . 2013. *Placer County General Plan*.
- . 2015. *Draft Environmental Impact Report Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan*.
- US Census Bureau. 2010. American Fact Finder, Community Facts: 96146. Accessed July 9, 2015.
- Washoe County, Department of Community Development. 2010. *Master Plan Population Element*.

#### **4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

---

This page is intentionally blank.